	Case 1:22-cv-01209-JLT-SAB Documer	at 36 Filed 11/28/23 Page 1 of 2				
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
10						
11	CHARLES ELLIS, SR.,	No. 1:22cv-1209 JLT SAB (PC)				
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND				
13	V.	RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS				
14 15	KERN COUNTY SHERIFF DEPARTMENT, et al.,	(Docs. 21, 35)				
16	Defendants.					
17	Plaintiff seeks to hold Sgt. Escandon and the County of Kern liable for the use of					
18	excessive force in violation of his rights arising under the Fourteenth Amendment. (Doc. 9) The					
19	County moved to dismiss Plaintiff's claim pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil					
20	Procedure, asserting Plaintiff failed to allege facts sufficient to impose municipal liability upon					
21	the County. (Doc. 21.)					
22	The assigned magistrate judge found Plaintiff stated a cognizable claim against the					
23	County, because "when viewed in the light most favorable to Plaintiff,[he] sufficiently stated					
24	that the County's policy of allowing custody staff to disapprove of medical professional's					
25	recommendations was the moving force behind Plaintiff's claim of deliberate indifference."					
26	(Doc. 35 at 6.) Therefore, the magistrate judge recommended the County's motion to dismiss be					
27	denied. (Id.) The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on the parties and notified					
28	them that any objections were due within 21 days. ( <i>Id.</i> ) The Court advised them also that the					

	Case 1:22-c	v-01209-JLT-SAB	Document 36	Filed 11/28/23	Page 2 of 2	
1	"failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal."					
2	(Id., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) No objections were					
3	filed, and the time to do so expired.					
4	According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court performed a <i>de novo</i> review of this case.					
5	Having carefully reviewed the entire matter, the Court concludes the Findings and					
6	Recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. Thus, the Court <b>ORDERS</b> :					
7	1.	1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on October 17, 2023 (Doc. 35), are				
8		ADOPTED in full.				
9	2.	2. Defendant's motion to dismiss (Doc. 21) is <b>DENIED</b> .				
10	3. Defendants <b>SHALL</b> file an answer within fourteen days from the date of service					
11		of this order.				
12						
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.					
14	Dated:	November 28, 20	023	UNITED ST	ML.TMWM ATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
15 16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						